



*Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement*

STEPHEN M. HAASE, AICP, DIRECTOR

### **Historic Landmarks Commission Design Review Subcommittee**

January 19 2005, 12:00 Noon – 1:30 PM, Room 400 Planning

Present: HLC Commissioner Leong, DRC Chair; HLC Chair Polcyn, DRC member;

HLC Commissioner Janke, alternate DRC member

### **SYNOPSIS**

#### **MEETING GOAL:**

**Review project designs for conformance with City of San Jose Historic Design Guidelines, based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties**

**12:00**

#### **PRE04-530**

##### **Fountain Alley Infill Site**

**Southeast corner of South Second Street and Fountain Alley`**

**Downtown Commercial National Register District**

Al Schlarmann, San Jose Parking

Jeff Current, Todd Trekell, Barry Swenson Builder

#### **Proposed Project:**

New construction of a 15-22 story tower with parking below grade and above street, retail and live/work at street level, and residential on levels 2-4, mid levels 5-11 and tower levels 12-19.

Approximately 180 residential units. Height to be below the 240' height of the historic Bank of America Building's shoulders.

#### **Downtown San Jose Historic District Design Guidelines** Infill Construction p. 26

**Height.** Maximum of four stories above grade, not to exceed 60 feet. ...The building height of infill construction that fronts onto Fountain Alley shall not exceed the roofline height of any existing adjacent structure.

**Massing** to be responsive in form and composition to prevailing character of the existing urban setting. .... Infill construction with extensive frontage on streets or alleys needs to be segmented into several smaller facades or buildings.

**Rear Facades** ..To be articulated and punched in a manner compatible with existing adjacent rear facades

#### **Public Comments**

Alex Marthews of PAC SJ stated that PAC is concerned about the project and the way city leadership is treating the height limit in the Guidelines as "just guidelines." The city has invested in parking projects of this kind before, and now we are being told by the owner that a building three times the 60 foot height prescribed in the Guidelines is necessary, but we have no tangible information. The Historic District Guidelines were developed through a long process by two sets of consultants. The idea of allowing development to the shoulder height of the B of A building was debated when the Guidelines were written, and was rejected. To allow the first major project out of the gate to ruin the District is the wrong way to go about it.

**DRC Comments (Fountain Alley cont.)**

There is not enough information to understand the project at this phase. Sections would be helpful.

This is the last thing to go in a series of historic blocks. The edge of Second Street should balance with the project across the street. Holding the lower height limit along Second Street makes sense. The tower will have serious shade and shadow impacts on Fountain Alley given the size of those buildings and the orientation of the site. Consider moving the tower to the south away from Fountain Alley and the B of A building.

The Guidelines state that the height limit in the Historic District should be 60 feet – the proposed massing does not work within the District.

The historic streetscape shouldn't be interrupted. The parking and pedestrian links appear to work with the Guidelines.

**12:30**

**PRE05-012**

Kelly Hyland, RDA

John McEnery IV, San Pedro Square Properties

**73 North San Pedro Street Rehabilitation**

**1902, ENR/ECR/SM, CS to ENRD**

Front Façade Features:

- Scored Stucco Finish over historic brick façade
- Storefront window openings above bulkhead on either side of central entry
- Recessed central entry with angled sidewalls
- New aluminum and glass canopy and signage

Rear Façade Features

- Roll-up steel service door
- Window opening

**Proposed Project:**

Proposed Use: Creative Café with exhibit space for artists, filmmakers and writers

Front Facade

- Paint stucco finish
- Add new replacement windows within existing openings
- Add new recessed entry doors
- Add new metal canopy, signage and lighting
- Replace angled recessed entry sidewalls with straight sidewalls

Rear Facade

- Replace industrial metal roll-up door with storefront window
- Add new replacement window within existing opening

**Standards for Rehabilitation**

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

**DRC Comments (73 North San Pedro cont.)**

The addition of the new metal awning seems to be in keeping with the building.

The existing angled entry walls can be removed and replaced with compatible new straight walls. The gesture of a recessed entry is enough.

**Public Comments**

Alex Marthews of PAC SJ stated that the proposal is excellent.

**1:00**

**Hitachi**

**5600 Cottle Road**

**Building 09/011: CCL, CS to ECRHR/CCL District**

Mid-Century Modern John Bolles design, Douglas Baylis landscaping and integrated art program

**Buildings 001, 005, 006, 007, 09/011, 010, 013, 014, 015: CS to ECRHR/CCL District**

Ken Kay, Jason Victor, KKA

Kyle McElroy, Hitachi

Cynthia James, JG

**Proposed Project:**

Hitachi is proposing to redevelop their existing campus by redeveloping the outer western section of the campus with new residential and commercial uses and consolidate their existing industrial square footage on the remaining central portion.

The project consists of:

- 1) Replacing approximately 1.2 million square feet of industrial buildings in the approximately 156 acre outer core, which is located roughly along the western portion of the site, with up to 2950 residential units and 460,000 square feet of commercial square footage.
- 2) Consolidating and redistributing approximately 1.4 million square feet of industrial square footage from the outer core to the approximately 146 acre core area. The core area currently contains 2.4 million square feet of industrial buildings. The project proposes the construction of approximately 981,000 additional square feet of building to the core.

The applicant proposes to preserve two historic buildings: Building 09 and 011, and the associated landscape features and art work, located in the proposed outer core to be developed with residential and commercial uses. The other seven historic buildings, located within the proposed core area, will be demolished in various phases.

The project also proposes to maintain the landscaped spine of the potential district, to have a visual connection to the closed campus along the fence at the spine and to display historic industrial information in Buildings 09 and 011.

**Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties**

2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

**Public Comments (Hitachi cont.)**

Alex Marthews of PAC SJ stated that PAC had toured the site and that the buildings of historic significance within the inner core appear to be poor candidates for rehabilitation. Marthews praised the proposed retention of Buildings 9 and 11 and voiced an interest in the future of Building 10 and potential preservation options.

**DRC Comments**

The proposal to run a street through the reflecting pools could be a “sticking point” and concerns were raised about relocating sculpture. Polcyn asked whether the reflecting pools had been added on to at any time. The project could key in on 010, 09, 011, the reflecting pool and the art. Building 010 relates to the “finger plan” of Building 025 and there is a relationship between the buildings. The importance of retaining the landscape plan and spine was confirmed. Janke stated that retention of the spine may be more important than buildings in the closed campus portion of the site.

It was agreed that 09 and 011 are important buildings – they reflect the campus, and that Building 010 is a good building.

It was also felt that tiles and perhaps some of the building elements could be re-used at other places on site.

It was briefly noted by the applicant and Planning staff that there is currently an effort to reach a solution on the retention of Building #25, whole or in part.